

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/761,207	Applicant(s) OI ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan A. Vu	Art Unit 2193	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tuan A. Vu. (3) Daito Kato.
 (2) Ray Mah. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hanselman.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative explained the essential of the model-driven tool as expressed in claim 1 and proffered that by allowing a means to delete and downsize the otherwise big amount of variations, the tool would create a more compacted software source when compared to prior art extensive code provisioning. The discussion also inquired the Examiner suggestion to rid of some 112 issues, and mostly to redirect the current state of the claimed subject matter for further favorable consideration. The examiner gave his interpretation or impression of what the claim entails; i.e. a computer-aided framework and common scenario which can be analogized with many current developing tools, one of which being Haselman - and indicated that the claim is too broad and there still are missing essential teachings that would help determining that the claim is about a automated apparatus (w/ hardware support) that can yield results without absolute dependency of interaction of user input; and that some underlying determination regarding data being entered, altered or compacted has to be in conjunction with some mechanism that help derive functionality (emphasis added) of a compacted model or subsystem based on which some code constructs could be automatically gathered. Also mentioned was the need to distinguish layers such as the user input, external data layer, interface layers (of the tool) to receive and convey data, and internal code functioning layer that provide intelligence to help filter needed transformation/requirements and thereby collect the optimized quantity of source code elements. That is, the crux being the underlying specific mechanism to help optimize code generation; and that care should be taken when apparatus claim does not sufficiently provide tangible executing means by which software entities get realized into real world transformed data. In response to the representative asking about where Hanselman discloses the current claimed subject matter, the Examiner indicated that any disagreement over the reference of record would be better provided as a written response to benefit duly and proper prosecution of merits..